ment of pains in the chest, pleurisy, bronchitis, asthma, pneumonia, la grippe, croup, whooping cough, complaints and irritations of the throat, bronchial tubes, and lungs, resulting or arising from coughs and colds, whooping cough, and hoarseness.

Dr. Hess Hog Special was alleged to be misbranded in that statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the package labels, and in an accompanying circular, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article would be effective in combating intestinal worms (ascarids) in hogs.

Red Cross Headache and Neuralgia Remedy was alleged to be misbranded in that statements regarding the curative or therapeutic effects of the article, appearing on the package labels, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article would be effective in the treatment of headache, neuralgia, insomnia, sick and bilious headache, nervousness, nervous affections, and painful menstruation.

Bees Laxative Cough Syrup was alleged to be misbranded in that statements appearing on the bottle labels, on the enclosing cartons, and in an accompanying circular, falsely and fraudulently represented that the article would be effective in the treatment of coughs, colds, croup, whooping cough, la grippe, bronchitis, asthma, all troubles of the throat, chest, and bronchial tubes, of all soreness of the throat, chest, and lungs, and of pneumonia, consumption, and lung and bronchial troubles.

On November 27 and 29, and December 2, 1935, no claimant having appeared, decrees of condemnation were entered and it was ordered that the products be destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26139. Adulteration and misbranding of fluidextract of aconite NF. U. S. v. 1
Bottle of Fluidextract of Aconite NF. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 36540. Sample no. 32814-B.)

This article was labeled and sold as a National Formulary product but its potency was less than half of that required by the formulary standard.

On November 8, 1935, the United States attorney for the Southern District of Iowa, acing upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of one bottle, containing approximately 1 gallon of fluidextract of aconite NF at Des Moines, Iowa, alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about June 24, 1935, by Allaire Woodward & Co., from Peoria, Ill., and charging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Fluid Extract of Aconite NF."

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that it was sold under a name recognized in the National Formulary, and differed from the standard of strength as determined by tests laid down in said formulary, and its own standard of strength was not stated upon the container.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement on the label, "Fluid Extract of Aconite", was false and misleading.

On December 30, 1935, no claimant having appeared, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

HARRY L. Brown, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26140. Misbranding of Bi-Sarcol. U. S. v. 34 Bottles of Bi-Sarcol, et al. Default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction in each of the two cases. (F. & D. nos. 36644, 36665. Samples nos. 53946-B, 54039-B.)

False and fraudulent curative and therapeutic claims were made for this article.

On November 25 and 30, 1935, the United States attorney for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, acting upon reports by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court, on each of said dates, a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 106 bottles of Bi-Sarcol at Harrisburg, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce, in part on or about October 4, 1935, and in part on or about November 16, 1935, by the Bi-Sarcol Laboratories, New York, N. Y., from Laurelton, Long Island, N. Y., to Harrisburg, Pa., and charging misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act as amended. The article was labeled in part: (Bottle) "Bi-Sarcol * * Prepared only by Bi-Sarcol Laboratories, New York, N. Y."

Analysis showed that the article consisted essentially of extracts of plant drugs, including licorice and a laxative drug, small proportions of inorganic

compounds, including magnesium and calcium compounds, and water (96 percent).

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that upon and within the package there appeared statements that falsely and fraudulently represented that it was effective as a curative and therapeutic agent to increase the amount of hemoglobin and the number of red blood corpuscles in the blood; to act on the stomach and speed the flow of digestive juices, to strengthen the digestive muscles, and to help rid the body of harmful acids, to tone the kidneys and stimulate their action thus aiding them to remove excessive impurities from the system, to make the kidneys and bowels function better and cause all common ailments to vanish, and to prevent susceptibility to the ravages of various diseases.

On December 30, 1935, no claimant having appeared in either of the two cases, a default decree of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction was entered in each.

HARRY L. BROWN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26141. Adulteration and misbranding of Improved Unguentum (Cintment). U. S. v. 165 Packages of Improved Unguentum (Cintment). Default decrees of condemnation, forfeiture, and destruction. (F. & D. no. 36661. Sample no. 44718-B.)

This product was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharma-

copoeia and differed from the pharmacopoecial standard.

On November 25, 1935, the United States attorney for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 165 packages of Improved Unguentum (Ointment) at Philadelphia, Pa., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about March 14, 1935, by the American Pharmaceutical Co., Inc., from New York, N. Y., and alleging adulteration and misbranding in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

Adulteration of the article was charged under the allegation that it was sold under a name recognized in the United States Pharmacopoeia and that it differed from the standard of quality and purity as determined by the test

laid down in the said pharmacopoeia.

Misbranding of the article was charged under the allegation that it was offered for sale under the name of another article, namely, "Unguentum."

On May 27, 1936, the American Pharmaceutical Co. Inc., claimant, having failed to prosecute its claim, judgment of condemnation was entered and it was ordered that the product be destroyed.

HARRY L. BROWN, Acting Secretary of Agriculture.

26142. Adulteration and misbranding of Farastan. U. S. v. 25 Gross Packages of Farastan. Consent decree of condemnation. Product released under bond for relabeling. (F. & D. no. 36682. Sample no. 50324-B.)

This case involved an interstate shipment of Farastan which was represented as an iodo-cinchophen compound when it contained only a small pro-

portion of an organic iodine compound.

On November 29, 1935, the United States attorney for the Southern District of New York, acting upon a report by the Secretary of Agriculture, filed in the district court a libel praying seizure and condemnation of 25 gross packages of Farastan at New York, N. Y., alleging that the article had been shipped in interstate commerce on or about October 29, 1935, by Sharp & Dohme, Inc., from Philadelphia, Pa., and that it was adulterated and misbranded in violation of the Food and Drugs Act.

The article was alleged to be adulterated in that its strength and purity fell below the professed standard and quality under which it was sold, since it was represented on the label of the packages and in an accompanying circular as "Mono-Iodo-Cinchophen Compound", and it consisted of cinchophen approximately 97 percent, and a small proportion of an organic iodine compound.

The article was alleged to be misbranded in that the statement "Mono-Iodo-Cincophen Compound" was false and misleading in view of the actual

composition of the article.

On December 12, 1935, the Farastan Co., claimant, having admitted the allegations of the libel and having consented to a decree, judgment of condemnation was entered, and it was ordered that the product be released under bond conditioned that it be relabeled.